

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested. Claims 1-22 and 31 are in this application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 23-30 and 32-33 have been cancelled. Claims 3-22 and 31 have been withdrawn.

Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate whether the substitute formal drawings filed on August 19, 2003 (and received by the PTO on August 25, 2003) have been entered into the application. Applicant notes that in the next communication following receipt of the drawings, applicant is to be notified by the Examiner if the drawings have been entered and, if not entered, applicant should receive an explanation as to why the drawings were not entered. (See MPEP §608.02(h).)

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. The title has been amended and is believed to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed.

The Examiner noted the preferred layout for the specification, which includes a Background of the Invention section and a Summary of the Invention section. Applicant acknowledges the traditional format of a patent application, but notes that the patent laws and patent rules do not require the inclusion of these sections. As a result, applicant has opted to omit these sections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that a first metal trace formed between a first saw street and a first semiconductor circuit, and a second metal trace formed between the first saw street and a second semiconductor circuit is unclear.

The Examiner argued that these phrases are unclear because it is unclear as to whether it is being referred a first metal trace formed in a first saw street and a

second metal trace formed in the first saw street wherein the first saw street is formed between the first semiconductor circuit and the second semiconductor circuit.

Applicant, respectfully, does not understand the Examiner's argument, but notes that claim 1 can be read onto applicant's FIG. 1. For example, saw street 116A shown in applicant's FIG. 1 can be read to be the first saw street of claim 1, metal trace 120 shown in applicant's FIG. 1 can be read to be the first metal trace of claim 1, and metal trace 122 shown in applicant's FIG. 1 can be read to be the second metal trace of claim 1. Further, the circuit labeled 110 lying immediately to the left of metal trace 120 in applicant's FIG. 1 can be read to be, for example, the first semiconductor circuit of claim 1, while the circuit labeled 110 lying immediately to the right of metal trace 122 can be read to be, for example, the second semiconductor circuit of claim 1.

Thus, as shown in applicant's FIG. 1, first metal trace 120 is formed between first saw street 116A and the first semiconductor circuit labeled 110 lying immediately to the left of metal trace 120. In addition, second metal trace 122 is formed between first saw street 116A and the second semiconductor circuit labeled 110 lying immediately to the right of metal trace 122. Thus, from what applicant can determine, claims 1-2 satisfy the requirements of the second paragraph of section 112. (As noted above, claim 33 has been cancelled.)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lunde (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,685). For the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part:

"a plurality of first saw streets that run parallel to the first sides between a number of the semiconductor circuits, each first saw street extending in a straight line from a point on an edge of the wafer to another point on an edge of the wafer;

"a plurality of second saw streets that run parallel to the second sides between a number of the semiconductor circuits, each second saw street

extending in a straight line from a point on an edge of the wafer to another point on an edge of the wafer;

"a first metal trace formed between a first saw street and a first semiconductor circuit, the first metal trace not crossing the first saw street; and

"a second metal trace formed between the first saw street and a second semiconductor circuit, the second metal trace not crossing the first saw street, the first saw street lying between the first semiconductor circuit and the second semiconductor circuit."

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner pointed to saw street FS shown on an annotated copy of FIG. 5 of Lunde as constituting the first saw street of claim 1, and saw street SS shown on the annotated copy of FIG. 5 of Lunde as constituting a second saw street of claim 1. In addition, the Examiner pointed to metal traces 46A and 46B shown on the annotated copy of FIG. 5 of Lunde as constituting the first and second metal traces required by claim 1.

The metal traces 46A and 46B, however, can not be read to be the first and second metal traces required by amended claim 1 because, as shown in the annotated copy of FIG. 5 of Lunde, metal trace 46A crosses saw street FS twice. As noted above, neither the first nor the second metal trace of claim 1 can cross the first saw street.

Thus, since the Lunde reference fails to teach first and second metal traces as required by claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by the Lunde reference. In addition, since claim 2 depends from claim 1, claim 2 is not anticipated by the Lunde reference for the same reasons as claim 1. Further, as noted above, claims 32-33 have been cancelled.

10/635,363

PATENT

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in a condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2-23-05

By:



Mark C. Pickering
Registration No. 36,239
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300
Telephone: (707) 762-5500
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504
Customer No: 33402

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL
ACTION MAILED DECEMBER 3, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 100-22100
(P05626)